UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,248	01/18/2001	Jason Weber	44431-233644 (13237-2750)	8161

			EXAMINER
27792	7590	12/23/2005	SAIN, GAUTAM

RONALD M. ANDERSON
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/765,248	WEBER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). ·
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1)   This is a NonFinal rejection in response to reply filed on 10/7/05 (via RCE).

2)   Claims 1-11,13-26 are pending and rejected in this action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3)   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/7/05

has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4-1)   Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted

1999)(hereinafter "Outlook"), in view of Thompson et al (US 2001/0003183, filed

Dec 2000), further in view of Uyehara et al (US 6154214, issued Nov 28, 2000).

Claim 1, Outlook teaches

A method for validating information in an electronic document, comprising the steps of:identifying a string having a ... associated with the string (ie., name in the query box is associated with a name in the list)(page 1, items a and b);

creating a request for information associated with the [unique identifier] (ie., typing the name in the query box)(page 1, item b);

selecting a reference material source that contains the information associated with the unique identifier (ie., global address list or any other list with names)(page 1, item c);

accessing the selected reference material source to obtain the information associated with'the unique identitier (ie., as user enters the name in the query box, outlook looks for the name in the Global address list)(page 1, items b and c); and

comparing the information associated with the unique identifier to the string to determine whether the string is valid (ie., compares Name from List to find one that matches, if any, thus valid)(page 1, item a).

Outlook does not expressly teach *unique identifier*, but Thompson teaches that a name can be a unique identifier that is associated with a string (paragraph 27).

Outlook in view of Thompson does not expressly teach unique identifier, but Uyehara does teach this limitation more specifically (ie., an electronic reading system which allows user to download books or content to hand-held reader device for viewing as well as allowing the user to look up the displayed word in a dictionary; Examiner interprets that the dictionary contains unique identifiers, especially upon reading the Applicant's specs.)(Abstract section).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook to include a Name as a unique identifier as taught by Thompson,

providing the benefit of formulating information requests in complex query languages

(Thompson, para 16), further to include a hand-held device that has a dictionary look up

feature as taught by Uyehara, providing the benefit of a user interface which is simple

and intuitive to use, which allows users to take advantage of the content's digital form,

so users have incentive to use the digital system in place of a printed publication (ie.,

dictionary)(col 1, lines 32-38).

Claim 2, Outlook teaches

wherein the step of comparing the information associated with the tmique identifier to

the string to determine whether the string is valid, comprises the steps of:

if the information associated with the unique identifier matches the string, then

determining that the string is valid (ie., if the name is found in the list, then it is

valid)(page 1, items a and b); and

otherwise, determining that the information associated with the unique identifier

updates the string (if a name is not in the personal address book, then a full name can

be created and properties about the Name can be changed)(page 2, item a).

Claim 3, Outlook teaches

wherein the step of identifying a string having a unique identifier associated with the

siring comprises the step of: searching the electronic document for strings having

tmique identifiers when the electronic document is opened (ie., when the personal

address book is open – searching for Name; examiner broadly interprets address book

as an electronic document, as a book is a collection of one or more

documents/pages)(page 3).

Claim 4, Outlook teaches

wherein the string is a nnme and the selected reference material source is an address

book (ie., Personal Address Book)(page 3).

Claim 5, Outlook teaches

wherein' the string is an address and the selected reference material sotlrce is an

address book (ie., Personal Address Book)(page 3).

4-2)   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted 1999)(hereinafter

"Outlook"), in view of Thompson et al (US 2001/0003183, filed Dec 2000), further

in view of Yahoo (see attached Non Patent Literature, Nov 9, 2000 and Sep 8

1999).

Claim 6, Outlook in view of Thompson does not expressly teach, but the Yahoo

reference teaches

wherein the string is a value associated with a stock symbol and the selected reference

material sotlrce is a real time stock quote (ie. yahoo lets a user enter a stock identifier

and yahoo provides a last trade value of the stock, if the stock symbol was not valid, no

quote would be generated)(see yahoo, page 1 and page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook in view of Thompson to include looking up stock symbols and real

time stock quote as taught by Yahoo, providing the benefit of looking up symbols (or

names) and getting valid information about the symbol (or name) if it exists in the

database or list (Yahoo, page 1 and 2).

**4-3)   Claims 7, 8, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over <u>Gehani</u> et al (US 5946687, issued Aug 1999), in view of <u>Uyehara</u> et al (as cited

above).**

Claim 7, Gehani teaches

A method for providing reference material, comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for selected [reference material] (ie., request for geographical

information)(col 2, line 11);

determining that an identity of a user is relevant to the selected [reference material] (ie.,

a name that is relevant to geographical information in the personal information

manager)(col 3, lines 20-25);

*creating a request for information requesting the selected [reference material] and

identifying the user* (ie., request for geographical information obvious that this includes a

location specific to an address)(col 1, lines 58-60; col 2, line 11);

selecting a [reference material] source based upon the request for information (ie.,

based on user request, Map, Weather or Yellow Page information may be

displayed)(col 4, lines 37-45);

*accessing the selected [reference material] sotzrce to obtain the selected reference

material* (ie., the Map, weather or Yellow Pages is accessed)(col 4, lines 37-45)', and

providing the selected [reference material] in a manner that is relevant to the identified

user (ie., geographical information is presented with MAP, weather or Yellow Pages into an appropriate request format)(col 4, lines 37-45; line 21).

Gehani does not expressly teach *reference material*, but Gehani does teach serving maps, yellow pages, and other types of geographical information to application programs which contact it (col 3, lines 38-50). These are reference materials because the program has to access these in response to the client request.

Gehani not expressly teach selected reference material, but Uyehara does teach this limitation more specifically (ie., an electronic reading system which allows user to download books or content to hand-held reader device for viewing as well as allowing the user to look up the displayed word in a dictionary; Examiner interprets that the dictionary contains unique identifiers, especially upon reading the Applicant's specs.)(Abstract section).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Gehani's teachings of maps and yellow pages information as reference material, providing the benefit of a personal information manager known by an address book including name, address that provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines 17-60), further to include a hand-held device that has a dictionary look up feature as taught by Uyehara, providing the benefit of a user interface which is simple and intuitive to use, which allows users to take advantage of the content's digital form, so users have incentive to use the digital system in place of a printed publication (ie., dictionary)(col 1, lines 32-38).

Claim 8, Gehani teaches

wherein the selected reference material is a set of directions and wherein providing the

selected reference material comprises: providing the set of directions so that the

directions begin with the identitied user's location (ie., Directions where user is

requested to supply the start address in order to get directions to and end)(col 5, lines

25-35).

Claim 9, Gehani teache

wherein the selected reference material source is one of a pltzrality of reference

material sotlrces, and at ieast one of the reference material sources is a remote Server

(ie., GeoServer for serving maps (#22) and routes and yellow page info to user)(fig 1,

item 20).

Claim 10, Gehani teaches

further comprising the step of accessing the selected reference material source ' via a

network (ie., network)(fig 2, item 34).

4-4)   Claims 11, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted

1999)(hereinafter "Outlook"), in view of Gehani (as cited above).

Claim 11, Outlook teaches

A system for integrating reference material into an electronic document, comprising:

an application program for creating the electronic doctlment and creating a request for

information to obtain selected [reference material]. wherein the electronic document

comprises a strinc having a uninue identifier associated with the string. and wherein the

reguest for informationcomprises the unique identifier (ie., the global address list or

personal address book contain names and where a user can type a portion of the name

in the query box and that identifies the full name)(outlook, page 1, items b and c);

Outlook does not teach, but Gehani teaches

Reference material (ie., maps, yellow pages, ...)(Abstract).

a reference engine for receiving the request for information from the application

progrnm, selecting one of a plurality of reference material sotlrces based upon the

request forinformation, and accessing the selected reference material sotlrce to obtain

the selected reference material (ie., GeoServer serves maps, weather, yellow page

based on user requesting info on a location)(col 3, lines 38-61); and

the plurality of reference material sources for providing the reference material (ie., map,

direction , weather , yellow pages ... based on what the user is looking for)(col 2, lines

65-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify outlook to include maps and yellow pages information as reference material

based on user requesting info on a location as taught by Gehani, providing the benefit

of a personal information manager known by an address book including name, address

that provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines 17-60).

Claim 13, Outlook teaches

wherein the application program compares the selected reference material with the

string to determine whether the string is valid (ie., the sought name is a valid name in

the address book or global list if it matches an entry in the list)(page 1, item a).

Claim 14, Outlook does not expressly teach, but Gehani teaches

wherein a user's identity is relevant to the request for information, and wherein the

request for information comprises an identifier for the user (ie., personal information

manager stores address info for the user)(col 1, line 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify outlook to include a person information manager that stores address info for

the user to access maps and yellow pages information as reference material based on

user requesting info on a location as taught by Gehani, providing the benefit of a

personal information manager known by an address book including name, address that

provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines 17-60).

Claim 18, Outlook teaches

wherein one of the plurality of reference material sources is an address book

associated with an electronic mail application program (ie., user can select from a

list)(page 1, item c).

Claim 19, Gehani teaches

wherein the request for information comprises a unique identitier associated with an

entry in the address book, and wherein the reference engine selects the address book

as the selected reference material sotzrce based upon the unique identifier (ie., based

on an address in the address book, use can get geographic information based on the

address)(col 1, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify outlook to include a person information manager that stores address info for

the user to access maps and yellow pages information as reference material based on

user requesting info on a location as taught by Gehani, providing the benefit of a

personal information manager known by an address book including name, address that

provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines 17-60).

Claim 21, Outlook does not teach, but Gehani teaches

wherein one of the pltzrality of reference material sources is a remote server (ie.,

GeoServer is remote from user)(fig 2, item 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify outlook to include a person information manager that stores address info for

the user to access maps and yellow pages information as reference material based on

user requesting info on a location as taught by Gehani, providing the benefit of a

personal information manager known by an address book including name, address that

provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines 17-60).

Claim 22, Outlook does not teach, but Gehani teaches

wherein one of the pltzrality of reference material solzrces is accessed via a network

(ie., network)(fig 3, item 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify outlook to include a person information manager on the network as taught by

Gehani, providing the benefit of a personal information manager known by an address

book including name, address that provides a user with maps, directions ... (col 1, lines

17-60).

4-5)   Claims 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted 1999)(hereinafter

"Outlook"), in view of Gehani (as cited above), further in view of Cconcepts'

Wordworks (see attached Non Patent Literature copyright May 1997)(hereinafter

"Wordworks").

Claim 15, Outlook in view of Gehani does not expressly teach, but Wordworks teaches

wherein the request for information includes a selected word and a request for a

definition of the word (ie., finding the meaning of words)(page 1, first paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook in view of Gehani to include finding the meaning of words as taught

by Wordworks, providing the benefit of a simple but effective tool that is a must for all

serious users who produce a lot of text (Wordworks, page 2 bottom).

Claim 16, Outlook in view of Gehani does not expressly teach, but Wordworks teaches

wherein the application program is a word processing progrnm having a selected

language, and wherein the request for information comprises an identifier for the

selected language (ie., English dictionary)(page 1, first paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook in view of Gehani to include finding the meaning of words from an

English dictionary as taught by Wordworks, providing the benefit of a simple but

effective tool that is a must for all serious users who produce a lot of text (Wordworks,

page 2 bottom).

4-6)   Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted 1999)(hereinafter

"Outlook"), in view of Gehani (as cited above), further in view of Microsoft Word

(see attached Non Patent Literature, copyright 1999)(hereinafter "MS-Word").

Claim 17, Outlook in view of Gehani dos not teach, but MS-Word teaches

wherein one of the pltlrality of reference material solzrces is a dictionary in a first

language and another one of the pltlrality of reference material sotlrces is a dictionary in

a second language (ie., allows for automatically detection of language for the

application)(MS-Word, page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook in view of Gehani to include automatic detection of language of the

application as taught by MS-Word, providing the benefit of an electronic document

authoring/creation system with valid information which are well know in the art for

validating spelling and grammar (MS-Word).

4-7)   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Microsoft Outlook 2000 (version 9.0.0.4527; copyrighted 1999)(hereinafter

"Outlook"), in view of Gehani (as cited above), further in view of Thompson (as

cited above).

Claim 20, Outlook in view of Gehani does not teach, but Thompson teaches

wherein the request for infonnation comprises key words summarizing the content of the

electronic document (ie., abstract concept is prepared for a keyword)(para 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Outlook in view of Gehani to include finding the abstract concept for a

keyword as taught by Thompson, providing the benefit of a library of query dictionaries

that relates keyword to abstract concepts for complex languages.

4-8)   Claims 23, 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Thompson (as cited above), in view of Wordworks (as cited above), further in

view of Uyehara et al (as cited above).

Claim 23, Thompson teaches

method for integrating a dictionary into an application program,

comprising the steps of:

in response to a selection of a dictionary control provided by the application program,

displaying a dictionary interface on a display device (ie., user interface to query for

keyword dictionary; table 1)(para 60);

receiving a request for a selected word (ie., query with keyword)(para 17);

based upon the request for a definition, selecting a dictionary tile (ie., does not teach

selecting a dictionary file but selects the most appropriate query from among the

instantiated query templates)(para 18, 19);

Thompson does not teach, but Wordworks teaches

accessing the dictionary file to obtain the definition of the selected word (ie., the

definition of a word 'provide' from the dictionary)(page 2); and

providing the definition of the selected word so that the definition is displayed in the

dictionary interface (ie., wordworks screenshot)(page 2);

creating a request for a definition of the selected word (ie., meaning of a word)(page 1).

Thompson in view of Wordworks does not expressly teach dictionary control provided in

the user interface, but Uyehara does teach this limitation more specifically (ie., an

electronic reading system which allows user to download books or content to hand-held

reader device for viewing as well as allowing the user to look up the displayed word in a

dictionary; Examiner interprets that the dictionary contains unique identifiers, especially

upon reading the Applicant's specs.)(Abstract section).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Thompson to include definition of a word from the dictionary where the

definition is displayed in the user interface as taught by Wordworks, providing the

benefit of a simple but effective tool that is a must for all serious users who produce a

lot of text (Wordworks, page 2 bottom), further to include a hand-held device that has a

dictionary look up feature as taught by Uyehara, providing the benefit of a user interface

which is simple and intuitive to use, which allows users to take advantage of the

content's digital form, so users have incentive to use the digital system in place of a

printed publication (ie., dictionary)(col 1, lines 32-38).

Claim 24, Thompson does not teach, but Wordworks teaches

wherein receiving a requeàt for a selected word comprises: ' receiving the selectéd word

via the dictionary interface (ie., definition of 'provide')(page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Thompson to include definition of a word from the dictionary where the

definition is displayed in the user interface as taught by Wordworks, providing the

benefit of a simple but effective tool that is a must for all serious users who produce a

lot of text (Wordworks, page 2 bottom).

4-9)   Claims 25, 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Thompson (as cited above), in view of Wordworks (as cited above) and Uyehara

et al (as cited above), further in view of MS-Word (as cited above).

Claim 25, Thompson in view of Wordworks does not teach, but MS-Word teaches

wherein the dictionary interface includes a language control and wherein receiving a

request for a selected word comprises: receiving a selected language via the dictionary

interface (ie., select language on dictionary interface)(page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Thompson in view of Wordworks to selecting language on dictionary interface

as taught by MS-Word, providing the benefit of an electronic document

authoring/creation system with valid information which are well know in the art for

validating spelling and grammar (MS-Word).

Claim 26, Thompson in view of Wordworks does not teach, but MS-Word teaches

wherein the dictionary interface includes a language control and wherein selecting a

dictionary file comprises: selecting a dictionary file associated with a language specitied

by the language control (ie., selecting the dictionary selects the file associated with the

language)(page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Thompson in view of Wordworks to selecting language on dictionary interface

as taught by MS-Word, providing the benefit of an electronic document

authoring/creation system with valid information which are well know in the art for

validating spelling and grammar (MS-Word).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-10,23-26 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues (on page

8)"outlook fails to disclose a string that is associated with a unique identifier associated

with information". To specifically teach this, the Examiner introduces the Uyehara

reference (see rejection above for detail). Applicant argues (on page 11) that

references do not teach information retrieved in a record must be provided in a manner

relevant to an identified user. To specifically teach this, the Examiner introduces the

Uyehara reference (see rejection above for detail). Additionally, Applicant argues (on

page 13) that reference does not teach dictionary control provided in a user interface.

To specifically teach this, the Examiner introduces the Uyehara reference (see rejection

above for detail).

The Examiner maintains the rejection because the combination of references

when viewed in their entirety teach the claimed limitations matter and one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the

references to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-

4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.S.

GS

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/21/2005